

**REMARKS**

In response to the Office Action mailed October 3, 2003, claims 1, 5 and 18 have been amended. No claim is cancelled or added. Claims 1, 5, 9-13 and 18-22 are now active in this application, of which claims 1, 5 and 18 are independent.

Entry of the Amendments and Remarks is respectfully requested because entry of Amendment places the present application in condition for allowance, or in the alternative, better form for appeal. No new matters are believed to be added by these Amendments. Based on the above Amendments and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the outstanding objections and rejections and they be withdrawn.

***Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103***

In the Office Action, claims 1, 5, 18 and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for being unpatentable over U. S. Patent No. 5,835,139 issued to Yun, *et al.* (“Yun”) in view of U. S. Patent No. 5,986,726 issued to Murai, *et al.* (“Murai”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites “a mold frame ... formed to be gradually thinner as further advancing from a first side adjoining said light source toward a second side opposite said first side” and “a chassis ... formed to be gradually thinner as further advancing from a first side adjoining said light source toward a second side opposite said first side”. Independent claim 5 also recites substantially the same.

In the Office Action, the Examiner admitted “Yun does not disclose ... the particular shape of the mold frame and the chassis, in the manner as recited in claims 1 and 5” (Office Action, Page 3). Regarding the missing claimed features from Yun, the Examiner asserted “as

noting in FIG. 5, Murai discloses expressly ... a rear plane of the mold frame (a bottom portion of a metal sheet 1) ...” (Office Action, page 3).

The Examiner has not pointed out where in Murai discloses the claimed chassis “formed to be gradually thinner as further advancing from a first side adjoining said light source portion toward a second side opposite said first side”. Instead, the Examiner asserted “it would have been obvious ... to form the mold frame of Yun as well as the chassis of Yun to be gradually thinner ... in view of the teaching in the Murai reference” (Office Action, page 6). Further, the Examiner stated “it would have been within the level of skill in the art and obvious to one having ordinary skill to engineering design the shape an element as desired ...” (Office Action, page 6). These assertions are respectfully disagreed with.

First, none of the cited references discloses or *suggests* the claimed chassis “formed to be gradually thinner as further advancing from a first side adjoining said light source portion toward a second side opposite said first side”. Figs. 1 and 5 of Murai show a metal bezel 8 that corresponds to the claimed chassis. The metal bezel 8 has an upper portion covering the edge of the display panel 5 and the side portion bent from the upper portion downwardly to cover the side of the assembly. In both Figs. 1 and 5, the side portions of the metal bezel 8 is extended downwardly beyond the U shaped engagement portion 11 of the metal sheet 1, which means the metal bezel 8 is formed not to be gradually thinner. Thus, the asserted combination would not result in the claimed chassis.

Also, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner’s position that it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify the second support frame 400 in Fig. 6 to be identical with the claimed chassis because a portion of the resin frame 2 is formed to be gradually thinner. Applicants believes that this position is highly subjective and

very unlikely and must have been afforded by impermissible hindsight which must be avoided during the examination.

Applicants also disagree with the Examiner's position "it would have been within the level of skill in the art and obvious to one having ordinary skill to engineering design the shape an element as desired". Applicants submit that this position is highly subjective and must have been afforded by impermissible hindsight which must be avoided during the examination.

Since the Examiner has not provided any objective and factual support for these positions, Applicants seasonably challenge the Examiner's positions. If the Examiner wishes to maintain these positions, the Examiner is respectfully requested to take an Official Notice, pursuant to MPEP 2144.03.

Second, it is submitted that the metal sheet 1 is not a mold frame. As explicitly described in Murai, the metal sheet 1 was provided to *reinforce* the thin resin frame 2, which is a mold frame that accepts the light module 7. The resin frame 2, however, does not accept the LCD panel 5, as clearly shown in Figs. 1, 2 and 5 of Murai. It is submitted that the entire Office Action is based on the inaccurate assumption that the resin frame 2 is not a mold frame, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the outstanding rejections based on the fact that, in Murai, the resin frame is a mold frame.

For these reasons, it is submitted that claims 1 and 5 are patentable over Yun and Murai.

Independent claim 18 recites "a liquid crystal display panel that has *a source printed circuit board* attached thereto ..." and "an information processing module *directly attached on a rear plane of said mold frame* and having a liquid crystal display panel driving circuit to generate driving signal to said liquid crystal display panel via said source printed circuit board".

In the Office Action, the Examiner admitted “Yun does not disclose expressly the information processing module (23) directly attached on a rear surface of the mold frame”. Regarding this missing claimed feature, the Examiner asserted “as noting in Fig. 5, Murai discloses expressly the information processing module (a driver circuit board 4) directly attached to a rear plane of the mold frame (a bottom portion of a metal sheet 1)”. This assertion is respectfully disagreed with .

As previously mentioned and also the Examiner specified, in Murai, the driver circuit board 4 is directly attached to the rear portion of the metal sheet 1. As shown in Figs. 3 and 4, in Murai, the driver circuit board 4 is *intentionally* attached to the rear portion of the metal sheet 1 because “electromagnetic wave noises generated from the driver circuit board 4 are securely shielded by the metal sheet 1” (Murai, column 4, lines 42-43). Since the driver circuit board 4 is spaced apart the resin frame 2 by the metal sheet 1, Murai fails to disclose or suggest “an information processing module *directly attached on a rear plane of said mold frame* and having a liquid crystal display panel driving circuit to generate driving signal to said liquid crystal display panel via said source printed circuit board”. Also, in Murai, the driver circuit board 4 is connected to a tape carrier package 6, not a source printed circuit board, as claimed.

Since none of the cited references these claimed features, it is submitted that claim 18 is patentable over Yun and Murai. Claim 19 that is dependent from claim 18 would be also patentable at least for the same reason.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection over claims 1, 5, 18 and 19 be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, claims 9-12 and 20-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Yun in view of Murai and further in view of U. S. Patent No. 5,475,381 issued to Williamson, et al. (“Williamson”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 9-12 and 20-22 are dependent from claims 5 and 18, respectively, which are believed to be patentable over Yun and Murai. For example, Yun and Murai fails to disclose or suggest discloses the claimed chassis “formed to be gradually thinner as further advancing from a first side adjoining said light source portion toward a second side opposite said first side”, as recited in claim 5. Also, Yun and Murai fails to disclose or suggest “an information processing module *directly attached on a rear plane of said mold frame* and having a liquid crystal display panel driving circuit to generate driving signal to said liquid crystal display panel via said source printed circuit board”, as recited in claim 18.

Williamson is directed to an infrared communication system but does not disclose or even remotely suggest the claimed features that are missing from Yun and Murai. Since Williamson fails to cure the deficiency from Yun and Murai, it is submitted that claims 9-12 and 20-22 are patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection over claims 9-12 and 20-22 be withdrawn.

***Other Matters***


In this response, claims 1, 5 and 18 have been amended for solely better wording. No amendment has been made to narrow the claimed scope because, as explained above, claims 1, 5 and 18 are believed to be patentable over the cited references.

**CONCLUSION**

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, claims 1, 5, 9-13 and 18-22 are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Hae-Chan Park  
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: December 9, 2003

**McGuireWoods LLP**  
1750 Tysons Boulevard  
Suite 1800  
McLean, VA 22102-4215  
Tel: 703-712-5365  
Fax: 703-712-5280  
HCP:WSC/kbs

\\COM242889.1